



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

**COPY MAILED**

JUL 30 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Hisashi Yamada, et al. :  
Application No. 10/046,739 : **DECISION ON PETITION**  
Filed: January 17, 2002 :  
Attorney Docket No. 3885-0102P :

This is a decision on the petition, filed May 4, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.181 (no fee) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application. The delay in responding is regretted; however, the petition was recently referred to the Office of Petitions for consideration.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application was held abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Restriction Requirement, mailed July 23, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed April 8, 2005. In response, on May 4, 2005, the present petition was filed.

Petitioner asserts that the Office action dated July 23, 2004 was not received.

A review of the application file reveals no irregularities in the mailing of the Office action of July 23, 2004. Thus, there is a strong presumption that the correspondence was properly mailed to the applicant at the correspondence address of record. In the absence of demonstrated irregularities in mailing of this Office action, petitioner must submit evidence to overcome this presumption. The following showing is required:

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if an one month

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if an one month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date one month from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

Petitioner has adequately supported his claim of non-receipt with the evidence provided.

In view of the above, the Notice of Abandonment is hereby vacated and the holding of abandonment withdrawn.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2814 for appropriate action in the normal course of business on the reply received May 4, 2005.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204. All other inquiries regarding this application should be directed to the Technology Center.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sherry D. Brinkley", is written over the printed name.

Sherry D. Brinkley  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions